



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,731	09/12/2003	In Hee Han	9988.056.00-US	4916
30827	7590	02/27/2006	EXAMINER	
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP			LU, JIPING	
1900 K STREET, NW			ART UNIT	
WASHINGTON, DC 20006			PAPER NUMBER	
			3749	
DATE MAILED: 02/27/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/660,731	HAN, IN HEE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jiping Lu	3749	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 7, 8 and 15-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 7, 8 and 15-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-3, 7, 8, 15-17 are now in the case and finally rejected as follows. Claims 4-6, 9-14, 18-20 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claims 7-8, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Holub (U. S. Pat. 1,550,700).

Holub shows a clothes dryer comprising a cabinet 2, a mixing pipe 28 having an inlet (at 41) disposed in the cabinet and one or more holes (on 52, see Fig. 2, also see page 5, line 21) configured to allow the air to directly flow into the mixing pipe from outside the clothes dryer same as claimed. The one or more holes are provided at a bottom portion 52 of the clothes dryer 2 and in front of inlet of the mixing pipe 28 (see Fig. 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
5. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holub (U. S. Pat. 1,550,700) in view of Schenck (U. S. Pat. 1,799,649).

The clothes dryer of Holub as above includes all that is recited in claim 16 except for the shape of the air holes. Schenck teaches a clothes dryer with long air holes 8a same as claimed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the clothes dryer of Holub to include long air holes as taught by Schenck in order to improve the drying efficiency.

6. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holub (U. S. Pat. 1,550,700) in view of Fig. 3 of applicant's admitted prior art.

The clothes dryer of Holub includes all that is recited in claim 17 except for the mixing pipe is installed on a bottom of the clothes dryer. Fig. 3 of applicant's admitted prior art teaches a clothes dryer with a mixing pipe installed on a bottom of the clothes dryer same as claimed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to install the mixing pipe of Holub on the bottom of the clothes dryer as taught by Fig. 3 of applicant's admitted prior art in order to provide a steady support to the mixing pipe.

7. Claims 1-2, 7-8, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fig. 3 of applicant's admitted prior art in view of Campbell (U. S. Pat. Re. 16,044) and Kee (U. S. Pat. 1,500,094).

Fig. 3 of applicant's admitted prior art shows a clothes dryer same as claimed except for a plurality of air holes in a bottom of a base adjacent a front area of an inlet side of a mixing pipe. Campbell teaches a clothes dryer with a bottom 7 of a base having air hole or openings 8, 9 along the front and rear for allowing air to flow into the cabinet from outside the clothes dryer. Kee shows a clothes dryer with a bottom 23 of a base having a plurality of air holes 27. Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the bottom of the base of the clothes dryer of Fig. 3 of applicant's admitted prior art with a plurality of air holes as taught by Kee and to further locate the air holes at the front area of the cabinet as taught by Campbell in order to improve the combustion efficiency.

8. Claims 3 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fig. 3 of applicant's admitted prior art in view of Campbell (U. S. Pat. Re. 16,044) and Kee (U. S. Pat. 1,500,094) as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of Schenck (U. S. Pat. 1,799,649).

The clothes dryer of Fig. 3 of applicant's admitted prior art as modified by Campbell and Kee as above includes all that is recited in claims 3 and 16 except for the shape of the air holes. Schenck teaches a clothes dryer with long air holes 8a same as claimed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the clothes dryer of Fig. 3 of applicant's admitted prior art to include long air holes as taught by Schenck in order to improve the drying efficiency.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 11/28/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive to overcome the rejection. First, broad claims fail to structurally define over the art. Please point out from the claims if any limitations not met by the prior art references. Second, the applicant argues that the Holub patent does not show "one or more holes configured to allow the air to directly flow into the mixing pipe from outside the clothes dryer, the one or more holes are provided at a bottom portion of the clothes dryer and in front of inlet". Examiner disagrees

because the patent to Holub clearly shows a mixing pipe 28 having an inlet (at 41) disposed in the cabinet and one or more holes (on 52, see Fig. 2, also see page 5, line 21) configured to allow the air to directly flow into the mixing pipe from outside the clothes dryer same as claimed. The one or more holes are provided at a bottom portion 52 of the clothes dryer 2 and in front of inlet of the mixing pipe 28 (see Fig. 2). Broad claim 7 fails to define what is "front". The air is directed to flow through holes 52 into the front of the inlet (at 28, 41). This is clearly shown by Fig. 2 of the Holub patent. Third, the applicant argues that references do not teach all limitations as set forth in claim 16. The examiner disagrees with the applicant because the Holub patent does show each and every claimed element in broad claim 7 except for the shape of the air holes. Schenck patent teaches a clothes dryer with long air holes 8a same as claimed. Therefore, in view of the combined teachings of the references it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to modify the clothes dryer of Holub to include long air holes as taught by Schenck in order to improve the drying efficiency. Fourth, the applicant argues that references do not teach all limitations as set forth in claim 17. The examiner disagrees because the patent to Holub shows each and every claim element as set forth in broad claim 7 except for the mixing pipe is installed on a bottom of the clothes dryer. Fig. 3 of applicant's admitted prior art teaches a clothes dryer with a mixing pipe installed on a bottom of the clothes dryer same as claimed. Therefore, in view of the combined teachings of the references, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to install the mixing pipe of Holub on the bottom of the clothes dryer as taught by Fig. 3 of applicant's admitted prior art in order to provide a steady support to the mixing pipe. Fifth, the applicant argues that there is no teaching to combine the prior art references in the 35 USC 103 rejection of claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 15 and 17. The examiner disagrees.

Art Unit: 3749

The applicant attacked each and every reference separately but failed to recognize the combine teachings of the prior art references. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Fig. 3 of applicant's admitted prior art shows a clothes dryer same as claimed except for a plurality of air holes in a bottom of a base adjacent a front area of an inlet side of a mixing pipe. Campbell teaches a clothes dryer with a bottom 7 of a base having air hole or openings 8, 9 along the front and rear for allowing air to flow into the cabinet from outside the clothes dryer. Patent to Kee shows a clothes dryer with a bottom 23 of a base having a plurality of air holes 27. Therefore, in view of the combined teachings of the references, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the bottom of the base of the clothes dryer of Fig. 3 of applicant's admitted prior art with a plurality of air holes as taught by Kee and to further locate the air holes at the front area of the cabinet as taught by Campbell in order to improve the combustion efficiency. Lastly, the applicant argues that the references are not combinable under the 35 USC 103 rejection of claims 3, 6 and 16. Fig. 3 of applicant's admitted prior art as modified by Campbell and Kee as above includes all that is recited in claims 6 and 16 except for the shape of the air holes. Schenck teaches a clothes dryer with long air holes 8a same as claimed. Therefore, in view of the combined teachings of the references it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to further modify the clothes

Art Unit: 3749

dryer of Fig. 3 of applicant's admitted prior art to include long air holes as taught by Schenck in order to improve the drying efficiency.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jiping Lu whose telephone number is 571 272 4878. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00 AM - 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, EHUD GARTENBERG can be reached on 571 272-4828. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3749

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Jiping Lu
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3749

J. L.